UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,020	01/12/2005	Kazuhide Mizutani	DK-US030061	9469

22919 7590 04/16/2009

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 20TH STREET, NW, SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2680

EXAMINER	
ALI, MOHAMMAD M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3744	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/521,020	MIZUTANI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MOHAMMAD M. ALI	3744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 February 2002*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *5-7* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *5 and 6* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claims 5 and 6 by amendment directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claim 5 recites a fifth step of charging over a refrigerant circuit unit belongs to another new embodiment which is different from the embodiment of the claim 5 as it was originally filed.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 5 and its dependent claim 6 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) as being anticipated by Unezake ET al (JP 2002-357377 A). Unezake et al disclose an air conditioner comprising existing refrigerant piping (4, 6) that was an existing air conditioner (See Fig 12) and contains residue of an existing of an refrigerant oil, a heat source unit (11, 28) and an user unit (23 evaporator/interior unit Fig. 12) that are connected together by the existing

refrigerant piping (4, 6) with a replace working refrigerant disposed therein; and an oil collecting device 9 that is configured such that after the existing refrigerant oil has been changed and before the refurbished air conditioner is run in a normal operating mode, the oil is collecting device 9 can draw in the replaced working refrigerant that is being circulated through the air conditioner and separate the existing refrigerant oil that is carried with the replaced working refrigerant, the replaced working refrigerant being an HFC refrigerant at least wt% of 32 See Fig.s 12, 13, 22-23, 25 and 27 and the translation. See also Para [0027] of machine translation.

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taira et al., (US 5,806,329). Taira et al disclose an air conditioner comprising existing refrigerant piping (16, 17) that was an existing air conditioner and contains residue of an existing of an refrigerant oil, a heat source unit (A) and an user unit (18/50 indoor heat exchanger/control unit) that are connected together by the existing refrigerant piping (16, 17) with a replace working refrigerant disposed therein; and an oil collecting device 12 that is configured such that after the existing refrigerant oil has been changed and before the refurbished air conditioner is run in a normal operating mode, the oil is collecting device 12 can draw in the replaced working refrigerant that is being circulated through the air conditioner and separate the existing refrigerant oil that is carried with the replaced working refrigerant, the replaced working refrigerant being an HFC refrigerant at least wt% of R32 See Fig.s 1, column 5, line 1 to column 6, line 20.

Regarding use of HFC refrigerant containing 40 wt% of R32 but containing R134a, Taira et al's refrigerant system is capable of using the same refrigerant with the same composition because existing refrigerant system containing Chlorine or Ozone depletion refrigerant can be replaced by the friendly environmental refrigerant as mentioned above and it is a well-known feature in the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/09/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding, amended portion an existing air conditioning being composed of an old heat source unit and an old user unit, Taira et al disclose existing air conditioning being composed of an old heat source unit (A) and an old user unit (B). See Fig. 1. Regarding further amendment portion of claim 7, the new heat source unit and the new user unit replacing the old heat source unit and the old user unit when updating the air conditioner is complete. Taira et al disclose the similar components of refrigerant washing, recovery and charging unit to the Applicant's invention. Therefore, Taira et al are equally capable of doing the same function of the Applicant's invention. See Fig. 1. And same is the Unezake et al as explained above. Therefore, the rejections are ok.

Applicant argues that Taira does not disclose changing over a refrigerant circuit that is composed of the existing piping with the new heat source unit and new user unit to normal operation state which has the oil collecting device attached thereto.

The examiner disagrees. When Taira discloses the similar component of the claimed invention and being used on the same purpose, Taira et al are equally capable of changing over a refrigerant circuit that is composed of the existing piping with the

new heat source unit and new user unit to normal operation state which has the oil collecting device attached thereto. Therefore, rejections are ok.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

/Mohammad M Ali/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3744